



**King County**

**Ron Sims**  
King County Executive

## **CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION**

*Mark Yango*  
*Charter Review Coordinator*

*701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3210*  
*Seattle, Washington 98104*

### **King County Charter Review Commission Governmental Structure Subcommittee**

#### **Briefing Paper – Elected/Appointed Officials** October 15, 2007

#### **Table of Contents**

##### **I – Historical Background**

##### **II – Current Opinions**

##### **III – Reports and Recommendations from Government Commissions**

##### **IV – Analysis from a National and State Perspective**

##### **V – Final Analysis**

##### **VI - Conclusion**

##### **VI – Appendix**

##### **I - Historical Background<sup>1</sup>**

Until 1969, King County, like most Washington counties, was governed by three county commissioners. The commissioners exercised both legislative and executive power, passing laws and administering many county departments. The county also had numerous other elected officials, including the assessor, auditor, clerk, coroner, prosecuting attorney, sheriff, and treasurer who ran their departments essentially independently of the commissioners.

A sequence of scandals during the 1960s involving the assessor's office, the prosecutor's office, and a courthouse remodeling project led the Municipal League and League of Women Voters to make attempts at establishing a Home Rule charter for the county.

The county commissioners placed the Home Rule Charter on the November 5, 1968, ballot. All three commissioners - John O'Brien, Ed Munro, and John Spellman - supported the charter adoption. The charter kept the assessor and prosecutor as elected positions, but made all other previously offices appointed positions. The charter also created elected offices for the Executive and a nine-member Council.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.historylink.org/essays/output.cfm?file\\_id=7944](http://www.historylink.org/essays/output.cfm?file_id=7944)

Many county officials, especially those who would lose elected positions, such as Sheriff Jack D. Porter and Treasurer M. J. R. Williams, opposed the charter. Also in opposition were the Council, deputy sheriffs, and other county employees who feared the charter would roll back recent labor gains in civil service protections and collective bargaining.

Despite the opposition, the charter sailed to victory with nearly 62 percent of the vote. As provided in the charter, a primary election to elect the Executive and the new County Council was held on February 11, 1969, followed by a general election on March 11, 1969. Commissioner Spellman, a Republican, won the Executive race and the Republicans held five Council seats to the Democrats' four.

Spellman and the new Council took office on May 1, 1969, when the new charter went into effect. As provided in the new charter and state constitution, the terms of elective offices that were abolished by the charter terminated on May 1.

Like most constitutions and charters, King County's charter allows for amendments, and it has been amended frequently in the years since its adoption. Many amendments were minor, but there have been some major changes. In 1992, in conjunction with the merger of Metro (the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle) with King County government, the County Council's size was increased to 13. A 1996 amendment made the sheriff's position elected, as it had been before the charter was adopted. A citizen initiative was passed in 2004 reducing the Council back to 9 members.

#### *King County Elections Director – History*

King County's Director of Elections has been an appointed position since adoption of the Home Rule Charter in 1969.

However, some critics believed the county elections department squandered the public's trust in a fundamental democratic process during the 2004 general election. The closest election in state history had left the outcome of the governor's race in limbo for months. A lawsuit revealed the office had lost, and failed to count, hundreds of absentee ballots. A total of 723 uncounted or improperly rejected ballots were discovered in King County during the manual hand recount.

Former Director of Elections Dean Logan resigned in June 2006. King County Executive Ron Sims thereafter appointed Sherril Huff as the Director of the Records, Elections, and Licensing Services (REALS) Division. Huff served eight years as Kitsap County auditor and the past two and a half years as assistant director for King County REALS.

Since 2004, three oversight groups have made recommendations regarding the department:

- 1) Citizens Elections Oversight Committee (CEOC)
- 2) King County Commission on Governance
- 3) King County Independent Task Force on Elections

In addition, many citizens and civic groups have continued to question whether the Director of Elections should be an elected position.

## Initiative 25<sup>2</sup>

On the heels of the above-mentioned elections problems, Initiative 25 was introduced to voters. This initiative, sponsored by *Citizens for Accountable Elections*, asks that the King County Elections Director be an elected non-partisan official who is accountable to all King County voters. The initiative calls for a separate election to elect an Elections Director to a four-year term.

If the initiative passes, the new Elections Director would have the authority to reconstitute a new, stand-alone Department of Elections and to staff this department with both new and legacy staff, at his or her discretion.

## *Sheriff – History*<sup>3</sup>

The office of Sheriff was elected from territorial days until adoption of the new Home Rule charter in 1969. Under the 1968 charter, the sheriff's office became the Department of Public Safety and the department director was the sheriff. That office and other formerly elected offices were appointed by the Executive. King County was one of only 11 counties in the nation with an appointed county sheriff.

In 1996, Councilmember Kent Pullen, with the support of two police unions, proposed an ordinance to place on the ballot a measure amending the charter to make the sheriff position elective instead of appointive. Pullen argued that an official accountable to voters would be a better advocate before the Council for law enforcement services than an official who owes his job to the Executive. Opponents of Pullen's measure included County Executive Gary Locke and incumbent Sheriff James Montgomery, who worried about politicization of the office. Pullen's measure passed the Council in May by a seven to five vote - all seven Republicans supported it and five of six Democrats were opposed (one was absent).

In November, voters passed the charter amendment. Montgomery was appointed Sheriff until the next election. Ron Sims, who became Executive following Locke's election as Governor, appointed Major Dave Reichert to succeed Montgomery. Reichert was elected sheriff in November 1997. He was confirmed after three County Council hearings and elected Sheriff by King County voters two times thereafter.

Sheriff Sue Rahr was appointed to replace outgoing Sheriff Dave Reichert in January 2005. She was later elected Sheriff in November 2005. Prior to her appointment as Sheriff, she was Chief of the Sheriff's Office Field Operations Division for over four years.

The elected Sheriff provides local police services for unincorporated area residents and 13 King County cities on contract. It also provides regional police services such as search and rescue, civil process, and sex offender registration to all County residents.

---

<sup>2</sup> [www.accountableelections.org](http://www.accountableelections.org)

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.historylink.org/essays/output.cfm?file\\_id=7707](http://www.historylink.org/essays/output.cfm?file_id=7707)

## *King County Assessor - History*

The 1968 charter maintained the assessor as an elected position. Currently, Scott Noble is the Assessor. He was elected in November 1992, winning reelection to his fourth term in November 2003.

## **II - Current Opinions**

The 2007-8 Charter Review Commission is discussing the issue of whether or not to elect or to appoint various county positions. While the Director of Elections position has been held under the most scrutiny, the elected Sheriff and the Assessor's offices have also been discussed.

The Charter Review Commission has heard from individual citizens, civic groups elected officials, community leaders and academics. Close to 20 people and civic groups, including King County Executive Ron Sims and Toby Nixon (former State Rep. and spokesperson for Initiative 25), have voiced their positions. Responses from the public have been mixed, with arguments having been made for both sides. Below is a summary of positions voiced.

<b>ORGANIZATION/INDIVIDUAL</b>	<b>ELECTIONS</b>		
	<b>DIRECTOR</b>	<b>SHERIFF</b>	<b>ASSESSOR</b>
King County Executive Ron Sims	Remain appointed	Change to appointed	
King County League of Women Voters	Remain appointed	Change to appointed	Change to appointed
Municipal League of King County	Remain appointed	Change to appointed	
Dick Albrecht, Former King County Freeholder	Remain appointed		
Toby Nixon	Change to elected		
King County Sheriff Sue Rahr		Remain elected	
King County Assessor Scott Noble			Remain elected
King County Democrats	Remain appointed		
El Centro de la Raza	Remain appointed		
34 <sup>th</sup> District Democrats	Remain appointed		
Robert Ransom, Mayor of Shoreline	Change to elected	Change to appointed	
10 other citizens on Director of Elections	Change to elected (8)  Remain appointed (2)		

10 other citizens on Sheriff		Change to appointed (6)	
		Remain elected (4)	

Below is a summary of the reasoning behind positions taken by some groups and officials

*League of Women Voters* – The late Chair of the King County League of Women Voters, Christel Brunnenkant, voice the league’s position that technical positions such as the Elections Director and Assessor should be appointed. She argued that candidates running for office are not necessarily fully qualified, while there is greater likelihood that appointees will be well qualified for their positions. She cited the Executive’s yearlong search to replace the previous Elections Director as evidence that the position calls for a highly competent employee. Ms. Brunnenkant stated that the League considers the previous elections director to be technically competent, while noting that the infrastructure of the Elections Department does need work.

*Municipal League* – Lucy Steers, the representative from the Municipal League argued for keeping officials appointed. The Municipal League believes that there is still a measure of accountability for appointed officials, because if citizens are unhappy with their performance, the public will hold the appointing official accountable. The Municipal League position is that those leadership positions in King County government which primarily requires policy making and representation should be elected. Positions requiring administrative and management expertise, however, should be appointed. The Municipal League opposed the 1996 charter change which brought about election of the King County Sheriff.

*King County Executive Ron Sims* – Executive Sims believes that the Elections Director should remain an appointed position and the Sheriff should be changed back to an appointed position from an elected position.

*Richard R. Albrecht* – Mr. Albrecht, a former King County Freeholder is in clear opposition to an elected Elections Director position. Mr. Albrecht suggested that instead of making the Elections Director an elected position, we must:

- 1) Achieve an understanding of the Director of Elections Position and the public’s expectations;
- 2) Set clear, definable qualifications for the position; and
- 3) Outline the selection process to find the person with the best qualifications

Mr. Albrecht also recommended criteria for measuring performance of the elections system. Mr. Albrecht argued that an elections director who is qualified to manage such a system is not a politician, who should be required to campaign every four years and maintain a high public profile. He believes the skill-sets and management capability needed for the position of Director of Elections would be best found in an appointed leader.

*Toby Nixon* – Mr. Nixon, a former State Legislator of the 45th District and author of Initiative 25 spoke in favor of electing the Director of Elections. He is also currently the Chair of *Citizens for Accountable Elections*, which spearheaded I-25. He recommends separating out the functions of the current elections department from the Executive's office and making the Director of Elections a nonpartisan elected official running an office that is dedicated to elections.

Mr. Nixon stressed that we need confidence that our elections are fair, accurate, and legal. He noted that an elected elections official has the ability to speak out and advocate changes needed to improve elections, and also to advocate for the resources needed to properly conduct elections. If an elected director fails, he or she cannot be protected by the appointing official.

Mr. Nixon commented that the original charter assumed that most offices would be appointed, and that these trained professionals would be insulated from politics. He stated that over time, elections came to be viewed as low priority in county budget negotiations. But election officials could not speak independently without consent of the Executive. Mr. Nixon said that elections integrity is only a small issue in Executive elections, leading to little accountability for elections with voters.

*El Centro de la Raza* - This social justice, non-profit organization holds the position that the elections director should remain an appointed official to ensure that it is not prone to political pressure and manipulation. At present the Director must be transparent and accountable to the County Executive and, by extension, the County Council.

*Mark Smith* – Mr. Smith, a professor of Political Science at the University of Washington spoke with a neutral point of view on the issue of electing versus appointing the Director of Elections. He did not take a position on whether the elections director should or should not be an elected position. Mr. Smith encouraged people to remain objective in deciding whether to elect or appoint the Director of Elections, arguing that this is more likely to yield a Director of Elections who is competent and fair.

Reasons outlined by Mr. Smith to prefer an appointed position include taking politics out of the process and avoiding undervote on the ballot. Undervote is the phenomenon in which voters vote in greater numbers for the positions at the top of the ballot than the bottom. Positions such as King County Executive receive more votes than the county judges, for example. The Director of Elections would be 'downballot' and receive fewer votes than the Executive receives.

Reasons given by Mr. Smith to prefer an elected position include consistency with the rest of Washington, where all other county elections auditors are elected.

Mr. Smith noted that "with either elections or appointments, you can end up with a person who is competent and fair. You can also fail with either process. There is no silver bullet."

*King County Sheriff Sue Rahr* – Sheriff Rahr defended retaining the Sheriff's elected position. In her presentation to the Commission, She stated that most counties elect their Sheriffs because of the structure of government and the need for independent leadership. Sheriff Rahr commented that she works very well with appointed chiefs in Seattle and they find it advantageous to have a Sheriff that can speak out on issues that he or she could not otherwise take a position on if he/she were appointed.

*King County Assessor Scott Noble* – Assessor Noble stated that as a representative of the citizens of King County, and as an elected, he can take those actions that he believes best protect their interests, promote fairness, fight against what is unfair, and try and keep citizens informed. As an elected, he is able to high standards of professionalism in the Assessor's office.

Assessor Noble also pointed out that he was able to challenge Referendum 47's tax shift provision before the State Supreme Court and in a two-year fight get it unanimously dismissed as unfair and unconstitutional. It would have specifically burdened average homeowners and senior citizens on property tax exemption programs. He was able to challenge Initiative 722 tax shift provision before the State Supreme Court and in a two-year fight get it unanimously dismissed as unfair and unconstitutional. Assessor Noble believes that if he were appointed he might not have been able to take that stance. Mr. Noble also supports clear job descriptions about the qualities and education, background and experience that the assessor should have.

### **III - Reports and Recommendations from Government Commissions**

As a result of the challenges that King County has faced in the aftermath of the 2004 gubernatorial elections, a number of commissions were convened to consider their positions on elected vs. appointed positions. The three commissions that analyzed this issue are:

- 1) Citizens Elections Oversight Committee (CEOC)
- 2) King County Commission on Governance
- 3) King County Independent Task Force on Elections

#### *Citizens Elections Oversight Committee (CEOC)*

In 2005, the **Citizens Elections Oversight Committee (CEOC)**<sup>4</sup> commented extensively on King County's elections system and process with implications for whoever would manage that system, but the CEOC did not make recommendations about elected vs. appointed officials specifically. Among the statements and recommendations that the CEOC made were the following:

- The election process requires leadership from elected officials as well as leadership, subject matter expertise and professional, competent management from its top appointed staff. (p. 25)
- Accountability and performance of the Elections Section depends on technical expertise, real-world elections experience, and management skills. (p. 25)
- County elected officials should hire elections managers with proven election expertise and sound management. (p. 26)
- Elections managers should use sound management in elections operations and develop good working relations with other branches of County government and the public. (p. 26)
- The Elections section should operate on a standard of professionalism, expertise, accountability and continuous improvement. (p. 59)

---

<sup>4</sup> The 13-member panel included representatives from the Municipal League of King County, the League of Women Voters, the Washington Secretary of State's office, the major political parties, and a King County school district. Three members of the committee were citizen representatives who were registered county voters. The committee monitored the management and operation of the county's Records, Elections and Licensing Services Division during the 2003 primary and general elections and made recommendations on ways to improve performance and accountability.

The CEOC does not take an express position on whether an appointed or elected official should oversee elections. It rather assumes that the position is appointed and focuses on professional, competent management, and the need to *hire* an individual with technical expertise and the ability to work collaboratively..

### *King County Commission on Governance*

Another source of recommendations came from the **King County Commission on Governance Report and Recommendations**, March 2004 (prepared by Berk & Associates).<sup>5</sup> That report called for retaining the County Executive, Council, and Assessor positions as elected and partisan positions; and appointing the Sheriff and elections administration officials because of their specialized and technical functions. (p. 5). The distinction drawn by the Commission was based on its view that government officials who make policy should be elected, and those who need specific technical expertise to perform the functions of their offices should be appointed.

According to the Commission, the offices of the Executive and the Assessor clearly have policymaking functions within the County government and should be held accountable by the voters. Moreover, the independence of a separately elected Assessor is an important check against possible corruption. This was echoed by Scott Noble in his presentation to the full CRC on September 25.

Conversely, the Commission viewed the oversight of police services as a position requiring technical expertise, therefore lending itself to appointed office. In addition, it noted that the need to ensure county-wide representation was becoming less relevant over time, as urban unincorporated areas annex to cities.

The Commission recommended that the Executive appoint a well-qualified professional to act as the elections official viewing elections functions as complex tasks and recommending that the position be depoliticized. The Commission further noted that only a minority of counties has elected elections officials. The Commission viewed election functions as a complex task and recommended that the position be depoliticized. Finally, a minority of Commission members believed that an elected auditor might contribute to greater accountability to citizens, allowing the auditor to advocate for changing technology needs and resources, and assure the security and quality and independence of the elections system. (p. 50-51)

---

<sup>5</sup> The Commission on Governance was an 11-member citizen panel created by King County ordinance and convened in spring of 2003, to examine four areas of County operations and funding. One of those charges was the governance structure to provide services, addressing the number of elected officials in all branches of government, whether those offices should be elected or appointed, partisan or non-partisan. The Commission's goal was to recommend specific governance reforms to the Metropolitan King County Council, the King County Executive, and the residents of King County.



## *King County Independent Task Force on Elections*<sup>6</sup>

Among the observations made by the King County Independent Task Force on Elections was that communications within the elections office—between upper management and front-line employees—were poor. In addition, public communications failed to convey the agency’s intended messages. (p. 7)

The Task Force found that a separately elected official with primary responsibility for elections would increase accountability to citizens and more effectively advocate for improved technology and resources as needed. According to the Task Force, the public demands more accountability in the elections process. (Report and Recommendations from the Independent Task Force on Elections Letter to King County Executive Ron Sims, 27 July 2005, p. 2)

The Task Force recommended a long-term change in elections governance and accountability, and noted that King County is the only county in Washington that does not place elections administration under the direct supervision of a separately elected official, usually an elected Auditor. Interestingly, this is contrary to what the Commission on Governance report claimed, that only a minority of counties has elected elections officials

The Task Force discussed briefly the position that appointed senior elections officials will be more professional, have greater managerial and technical experience of complex elections processes and procedures, and be immediately accountable to the County Executive if significant problems arise. This was the position put forth by a minority of the Commission on Governance.

The Task Force argued, however that an elected official in a non-partisan race with primary responsibility for conducting elections would increase accountability to citizens, be better able to educate and encourage citizens to participate fully in the electoral process, be a more effective advocate for improved technology and resources, and establish an independent elections system.

Provided below is a detailed summary of reasons why the elections director should or should not be elected.

### **Reasons for having separately elected officials responsible for elections:**

- to ensure independence in the conduct of elections;
- to ensure the ability to seek additional resources and improved technology, which is not possible under the current system;
- to increase accountability to citizens and establish a more independent elections system (in keeping with the recommendations of other groups, including some members of the King County Governance Commission);

---

<sup>6</sup> The Independent Task Force on Elections was a 10 member committee appointed by the King County Executive to develop short- and long-term recommendations that would improve the effectiveness of the elections process in King County. Its work was submitted to the Executive on July 27, 2005.

- to regain public confidence and trust, especially given the loss of public confidence in King County's elections system as a result of the counting and recounting of votes cast in the 2004 gubernatorial election,

**Reasons for maintaining the current structure in which the Division Director and the Superintendent of Elections are managing elections:**

- Some groups, including a majority of the members of the King County Commission on Governance, advocated for maintaining the appointment of senior elections officials based on the premise that appointed officials are more professional and have greater managerial and technical experience in complex elections processes and procedures.
- If the head of elections was elected, a change in leadership because of incompetence could not be made immediately and would likely not be possible until the next campaign for that office.
- Given the advantages of incumbency, a person who promises much while campaigning but fails to deliver on those promises while governing might hold the office for years.
- King County already has appointed professionals who perform all the roles of a County Auditor including an Auditor who is appointed by and reports to the County Council. It argued that an additional County elected official who performs these roles would significantly complicate governance and budget coordination.

Finally, a summary of the positions from each of the three community group reports are provided below for your review.

**Summary of Positions – Commissions**

Appointed versus Elected Positions			
Commission	Elections	Assessor	Sheriff
Citizen's Elections Oversight Committee (CEOC)	The CEOC does not indicate that it favors an appointed official to oversee elections. The focus on professional, competent management, however, and the need to <i>hire</i> an individual with technical expertise and the ability to work collaboratively suggests that it is a position for which there are specific qualifications that could be assured only by appointment versus election.		
King County Commission on Governance	Appointed	Elected and partisan	Appointed
Independent Task Force on Elections.	n/a	Elected	n/a

## IV - Analysis from a National and State Perspective

An analysis of the status of elected/appointed positions in other municipalities within the state and around the country adds another layer of data to the consideration of whether these positions should be elected or appointed.

### *National Perspective*

As we look at other counties across the nation and the state, we can observe some interesting results. Overall within the top 25 most populous counties in the nation, 76 percent of all counties have an elected elections auditor, while other counties are consistent in electing their sheriff and assessor. 76 percent of counties elect their county assessor, while 80 percent of counties have an elected sheriff.

The table below illustrates our findings:

**TOP 25 COUNTIES IN THE NATION**

<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>ASSESSOR</b>	<b>ELECTIONS AUDITOR</b>	<b>SHERIFF</b>
National Counties (25)			
Elected	19/25	6/25	20/25
Appointed	6/25	19/25	5/25

Assumption: 25 Largest Counties over 1.2 million in population, including King County

\* See appendix for list of Counties and population size, square miles

### *Local Perspective*<sup>7</sup>

Until 1969, all Washington counties operated under the commission form of government. However, since then, six counties have adopted home rule charters: Clallam (1979), King (1969), Pierce (1981), Snohomish (1980), Whatcom (1979) and San Juan (2005).

#### Executive Branch

Of the six home rule charter counties, five have adopted the council-executive form of government. The county executive is elected in King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Whatcom counties, and is appointed in San Juan County. The county executive is responsible for general administration and operation of the county. The executive is also responsible for proposing the budget and, in the case of an elected county executive, has a veto power over most council actions.

Clallam County has retained the three-member commission form of government with responsibilities similar to boards of commissioners in non-charter counties, and also has an appointed county administrator.

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.mrsc.org/Subjects/Governance/locgov12.aspx#3>

## Legislative Branch

In the five council-executive charter counties, the size of the council ranges from five members in Snohomish County to nine in King County. The council's primary duty is to adopt a budget and establish county policy.

All charter counties, except for San Juan County, have partisan elected legislative bodies. The council positions in San Juan County are elected on a non-partisan basis. All of the four elected county executives are partisan positions.

## Other Elected Officials

The six charter counties vary greatly in their treatment of the offices of the assessor, auditor, superior court clerk, sheriff and treasurer. The assessor is an elected position in every county, although some make the position non-partisan. The county auditor is an elected officer in all but one county (King), where the auditor is appointed by the council. But unlike other counties, King County's auditor does not control the elections department. The Elections Director in King County is currently appointed by the County Executive. The clerk is an appointive position in all but two counties (Snohomish and San Juan), with the appointing authority varying among the commissioners, the superior court judges, and the executive (with council confirmation).

The sheriff is now an elected position in all but one county (Pierce – however Pierce County is changing their Sheriff to an elected position next year). Finally, the treasurer continues to be an elected position in all but one county (King). Pierce County has combined the assessor and treasurer into a single elected position.

The table below illustrates, Washington State has a history of retaining elected positions with each of the three positions under analysis. The only position that remains appointed is the King County elections director.

**TOP 12 COUNTIES IN WASHINGTON STATE**

<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>ASSESSOR</b>	<b>ELECTIONS AUDITOR</b>	<b>SHERIFF</b>
Washington Counties (12)			
Elected	12/12	11/12	12/12
Appointed		1/12	

Assumption: 12 Largest Counties over 200,000 in population, includes all counties with home rule charter as well including King

\* See appendix for list of Counties and population size, square miles

## **V - Final Analysis**

### *Arguments for an elected position:*

In the final analysis, supporters for an elected position argue that an elected official would be more accountable to voters. Proponents assert that during the budget process, an elected official

would be more aggressive in securing needed resources, because he or she would be operating independently of the King County Executive, who might wish to make budget cuts.

Proponents also contend that appointees may be from out of state, with no history or ties to the local community. Finally, proponents assert that voters have the wisdom and should be trusted to make the right choice from among candidates to assure a high level of competency and professionalism in the elected official.

*Arguments for an appointed position:*

Proponents for an appointed official contend that many King County officials were changed from an elected to an appointed position nearly 30 years ago because of corruption under the old system.

Many positions now are currently appointed by the King County Executive, and confirmed by the county council. Proponents argue that appointments allow broad and even nation-wide searches for the best qualified professionals. Elections might not guarantee obtaining qualified candidates for voter approval.

Those in favor of appointed offices argue that the ability of an elected official to be more effective in the budget process is overstated. The county's resources are finite and limited, and the official cannot create new money. An experienced professional appointed by the King County executive is more likely to be a more credible advocate in budget matters.

Finally, appointment proponents maintain that an elected official cannot be free from the political distraction of re-election campaigns and the soliciting of campaign contributions.

## **VI - Conclusion**

There seems to be no perfect system for dealing with the perceived deficiencies in an elected or an appointed official. In an election free from undue influence from fundraising or partisanship, it is possible for well-informed voters to choose a candidate who is a highly qualified professional. On the other hand, the elected King County Executive making appointments is also directly accountable to county voters and can quickly take corrective action when an appointee is not performing satisfactorily.

While reasonable arguments can be made either in support of or in opposition to electing or appointing particular offices, there is no assurance that an elected or an appointed official will result in desired performance improvements.

Respectfully submitted by Mark Yango

## Appendix

<b>JURISDICTION - National</b>	<b>POPULATION</b>	<b>SQ. MILES</b>
<b>Los Angeles County, CA</b>	9,937,739	4,061
<b>New York City, NY</b>	8,143,197	309
<b>Cook County, IL</b>	5,327,777	946
<b>Harris County, TX</b>	3,644,285	1,729
<b>Maricopa County, AZ</b>	3,501,001	9,204
<b>Orange County, CA</b>	2,987,591	790
<b>San Diego County, CA</b>	2,987,591	4,204
<b>Miami-Dade County, FL</b>	2,363,600	1,945
<b>Dallas County, TX</b>	2,294,706	880
<b>Wayne County, MI</b>	2,016,202	614
<b>San Bernadino County, CA</b>	1,921,131	20,062
<b>Riverside County, CA</b>	1,871,950	7,208
<b>King County, WA</b>	1,808,300	2,126
<b>Broward County, FL</b>	1,754,893	1,209
<b>Santa Clara County, CA</b>	1,685,188	1,291
<b>Clark County, NV</b>	1,650,671	7,911
<b>Tarrant County, TX</b>	1,588,088	864
<b>Bexar County, TX</b>	1,493,965	1,247
<b>Suffolk County, NY</b>	1,475,488	911
<b>Philadelphia County, PA</b>	1,470,151	135
<b>Alameda County, CA</b>	1,455,235	738
<b>Sacramento County, CA</b>	1,352,445	966
<b>Cuyahoga County, OH</b>	1,351,009	458
<b>Nassau County, NY</b>	1,339,641	287
<b>Allegheny County, PA</b>	1,250,867	730

<b>JURISDICTION – WA State</b>	<b>POPULATION</b>	<b>SQ. MILES</b>
<b>King County - HR</b>	1,808,300	2,134
<b>Pierce County - HR</b>	755,900	1,790
<b>Snohomish County - HR</b>	655,800	2,090
<b>Spokane County</b>	436,300	1,756
<b>Clark County</b>	391,500	657
<b>Kitsap County</b>	240,400	393
<b>Thurston County</b>	224,100	727
<b>Yakima County</b>	222,581	4,296
<b>Whatcom County - HR</b>	180,800	2,151
<b>Skagit County</b>	110,900	1,735
<b>Clallam County - HR</b>	66,800	1,739
<b>San Juan County - HR</b>	15,500	175